

Direct CP violation in $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{(*)\pm}$

C. Q. Geng^{1,2}, Y. K. Hsiao^{1,2} and J. N. Ng²

¹*Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan 300*

²*Theory group, TRIUMF, 4004 Wesbrook Mall,
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 2A3, Canada*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

Abstract

We study the direct CP violation in $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{(*)\pm}$ decays in the standard model. We point out that these three-body baryonic B decays can be important tools for detecting the direct CP violation in the charged B system, in which there are no conclusive signatures yet. In particular, we show that the direct CP violating asymmetry in $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{*\pm}$ is around 22% which supports the recent data by the BABAR Collaboration.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 13.25.Hw, 12.15.Hh

One of the most important purpose to study B physics is to test the mechanism of CP violation as given in the Cabbibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) framework [1] of the Standard Model (SM) and search for new physics. Although the data of the mixing induced CP asymmetry in $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi K_S$ [2, 3] as well as the direct CP asymmetry in $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ [4, 5] and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ [6] have been measured precisely, analogous observations for the charged modes are not conclusive yet. The situation is similar even in $K^\pm$ decays. To study CP violations in charged B decays using two body modes there exist challenges in both theory and experiments. For example, these charged modes involve the neutral final states which make for low experimental efficiencies. Moreover, the present data fail to match the expectations of the SM in the $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm \pi$ decays. The SM predicts that some of them should have a direct CP asymmetry very close to those of their neutral partners [5, 7]. As a consequence, there appears to have room for the contribution of new physics [8, 9, 10]. On the other hand, even some CP violations are found in the promising modes, such as $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm \pi^0$ and $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi^0 K^\pm$, clear theoretical understandings would still be hard to achieve due to the hadronic uncertainties [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. It is therefore crucial to thoroughly examine CP violation in the charged B system because not only it is a long standing puzzle but also it may hide new physics.

In this letter, we will study the direct CP violation in the three-body baryonic charged B decays of $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{(*)\pm}$. Note that there is no neutral final state in the decays and hopefully that will make for a clean experimental signature at the price of lower branching ratio. Recently, the experiments [17, 18, 19] with threshold effects [20] and large forward-backward angular and Dalitz plot distribution asymmetries have eliminated large uncertainties from the strong interactions as they reveal more information for the decay mechanisms than the two-body ones. As a result, the decays of $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{(*)\pm}$ could provide good probes to investigate the weak phase in the charged B system. We shall demonstrate that these three-body baryonic B decays can be important tools for CP violation due to their simple amplitudes theoretically and we expect them to be well measured experimentally [21] in the near future.

From the effective Hamiltonian at the quark level for B decays [22], the amplitudes of

$B^- \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^-$ and $B^- \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{*-}$ are approximately given by [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_K &\simeq i\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}m_b f_K \left[\alpha_K \langle p\bar{p}|\bar{u}b|B^- \rangle + \beta_K \langle p\bar{p}|\bar{u}\gamma_5 b|B^- \rangle \right], \\ \mathcal{A}_{K^*} &\simeq \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}m_{K^*} f_{K^*} \varepsilon^\mu \alpha_{K^*} \langle p\bar{p}|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)b|B^- \rangle,\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

respectively, where G_F is the Fermi constant, $f_{K^{(*)}}$ is the meson decay constant, given by $\langle K^-|\bar{s}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 u|0\rangle = -if_K q_\mu$ ($\langle K^{*-}|\bar{s}\gamma_\mu u|0\rangle = m_{K^*} f_{K^*} \varepsilon_\mu$) with q_μ (ε_μ) being the four momentum (polarization) of K^- (K^{*-}), and $\alpha_{K^{(*)}}$ and β_K are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_K &\equiv V_{ub}V_{us}^* a_1 - V_{tb}V_{ts}^* \left[a_4 + a_6 \frac{2m_K^2}{m_b m_s} \right], \\ \beta_K &\equiv V_{ub}V_{us}^* a_1 - V_{tb}V_{ts}^* \left[a_4 - a_6 \frac{2m_K^2}{m_b m_s} \right], \\ \alpha_{K^*} &\equiv V_{ub}V_{us}^* a_1 - V_{tb}V_{ts}^* a_4,\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

where V_{ij} are the CKM matrix elements and a_i ($i = 1, 4, 6$) are given by

$$a_1 = c_1^{eff} + \frac{1}{N_c} c_2^{eff}, \quad a_4 = c_4^{eff} + \frac{1}{N_c} c_3^{eff}, \quad a_6 = c_6^{eff} + \frac{1}{N_c} c_5^{eff}, \quad (3)$$

with c_i^{eff} ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$) being effective Wilson coefficients (WC's) shown in Refs. [22] and N_c the color number for the color-octet terms. We note that for the decay amplitudes in Eq. (1) we have neglected the small contributions [27, 28] from $\langle p\bar{p}|J_1|0\rangle\langle K^{(*)}|J_2|B\rangle$ involving the *vacuum* $\rightarrow p\bar{p}$ time-like baryonic form factors [29], where $J_{1,2}$ can be (axial-)vector or (pseudo)scalar currents. However, in our numerical analysis we will keep all amplitudes including the ones neglected in Eq. (1).

The direct CP asymmetries in $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}M^\pm$ with $M = K$ and K^* are defined by

$$A_{CP}(M) = \frac{\Gamma(B^- \rightarrow p\bar{p}M^-) - \Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow p\bar{p}M^+)}{\Gamma(B^- \rightarrow p\bar{p}M^-) + \Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow p\bar{p}M^+)}, \quad (4)$$

while the decay rates can be evaluated from Eq. (1) after integrations over the three-body phase spaces. Interestingly from Eqs. (1) and (4) we derive the simple results:

$$\begin{aligned}A_{CP}(K) &= \left(\frac{|\alpha_K|^2 - |\bar{\alpha}_K|^2}{|\alpha_K|^2 + |\bar{\alpha}_K|^2} + R_\beta^- \right) / (1 + R_\beta^+), \\ A_{CP}(K^*) &= \frac{|\alpha_{K^*}|^2 - |\bar{\alpha}_{K^*}|^2}{|\alpha_{K^*}|^2 + |\bar{\alpha}_{K^*}|^2},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where

$$R_\beta^\pm \equiv \left(\frac{|\beta_K|^2 \pm |\bar{\beta}_K|^2}{|\alpha_K|^2 + |\bar{\alpha}_K|^2} \right) R \quad (6)$$

with R being around 0.27 and $\bar{\alpha}_{K^{(*)}}$ and $\bar{\beta}_{K^{(*)}}$ denote the values of the corresponding antiparticles, respectively. It is easy to see that $A_{CP}(K^*)$ is independent of the phase spaces as well as the hadronic matrix elements. As a result, the hadron parts along with their uncertainties in $A_{CP}(K^*)$ are divided out in Eq. (5). On the other hand, although $A_{CP}(K)$ seems to suffer from the hadron uncertainty due to $R_\beta^\pm$ in Eq. (6), by noticing that $(R_\beta^+, R_\beta^-) \simeq (0.047, 0.002)$ are small numbers, as a rough estimate we may neglect the $R_\beta^\pm$ terms in Eq. (6), which implies that the hadronic uncertainty for $A_{CP}(K)$ is also suppressed. We note that the CP asymmetries in Eq. (6) are related to the weak phase of $\gamma(\phi_3)$ [30].

In our numerical calculations, the CKM parameters are taken to be [30] $V_{ub}V_{us}^* = A\lambda^4(\rho - i\eta)$ and $V_{tb}V_{ts}^* = -A\lambda^2$ with $A = 0.818$, $\lambda = 0.2272$, the values of (ρ, η) are $(0.221, 0.340)$ [30]. We remark that a_i contain both weak and strong phases, induced by η and quark-loop rescatterings [31], respectively. Explicitly, at the scale m_b and $N_c=3$, we obtain a set of a_1 , a_4 , and a_6 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= 1.05, \\ a_4 &= [(-427.8 \mp 9.1\eta - 3.9\rho) + i(-83.2 \pm 3.9\eta - 9.1\rho)] \times 10^{-4}, \\ a_6 &= [(-595.5 \mp 9.1\eta - 3.9\rho) + i(-83.2 \pm 3.9\eta - 9.1\rho)] \times 10^{-4}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for the $b \rightarrow s$ ($\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{s}$) transition. Our results on the direct CP violation are shown in Table I. In the table, we have included the possible fluctuations induced from non-factorizable effects,

TABLE I: Direct CP asymmetries in $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}M^\pm$ ($M = K, K^*$), where the errors in our work represent the possible fluctuations induced from non-factorizable effects, time-like baryonic form factors and CKM matrix elements, respectively.

$A_{CP}(M)$	$A_{CP}(K)$	$A_{CP}(K^*)$
our work	$0.06 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.01$	$0.22_{-0.03}^{+0.04} \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01$
BELLE [17]	$-0.05 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.01$	————
BABAR [19, 21]	$-0.13_{-0.08}^{+0.07} \pm 0.04$	0.26 ± 0.19

time-like baryonic form factors and CKM matrix elements, respectively. We note that the uncertainties from time-like baryonic form factors are constrained by the data of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow n\bar{p}D^{*+}$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{p}\pi^+$ [29] and the errors on the CKM elements are from ρ and η given in Ref. [30]. It is interesting to point out that the large value of $A_{CP}(B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{*\pm})=22\%$

is in agreement with the BABAR data of $(26 \pm 19)\%$ as given in Ref. [21]. However, taken at face value; the sign of our prediction $A_{CP}(K) \sim 0.06$ for $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^\pm$ is different from those of $-0.05 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.01$ and $-0.13^{+0.07}_{-0.08} \pm 0.04$ measured by the BELLE [17] and BABAR [19, 21] Collaborations, respectively. Since the uncertainties of both experiments are still large it is too early to make a firm conclusion.

In term of the hadronization approach in Eqs. (1) and (2), there usually exist some uncertainties. These come from nonfactorizable effects when gluons are attached to all hadrons, annihilation contributions when the B meson decays into the vacuum by the W boson emitting or exchange as well as final state interactions. We find that they are all small in our case as shown in Table I. Our reasons may be outlined as follows:

- I. Although the nonfactorizable terms cannot be directly and unambiguously figured out by theoretical calculations, in the generalized factorization method [22] we could estimate the uncertainty by parameterizing N_c in Eq. (3) as the effective color number N_c^{eff} running from 2 to ∞ . Explicitly using this we find that the maximal deviations for $A_{CP}(K^{(*)})$ are less than 0.01 and 0.04, respectively.
- II. In the perturbative QCD approach (PQCD), the threshold effects measured by the experiments can be explained by power expanding the form factors in terms of $1/t^n$, where $t \equiv (p_p + p_{\bar{p}})^2$ and $n \geq 2$ due to gluon propagators attaching to valence quarks for the proton-antiproton pair [23, 27, 32, 33, 34]. The amplitudes from the annihilation terms are then much suppressed as $t \rightarrow m_b^2$ which is the squared transmitting energy.
- III. For the final state interactions, the most possible source is via the two-particle rescattering to the proton pair, such as $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2 K^{(*)} \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{(*)}$ with $M_{1,2}$ representing the meson states. However, such processes would shape the curve associated with the phase spaces in the decay rate distributions [35, 36, 37], which have been excluded in the charmless baryonic B decay experiments. Other types of the final state interactions have been parameterized into the $B^- \rightarrow p\bar{p}$ form factors with the data in Ref. [18], which are insensitive to $A_{CP}(K^{(*)})$ as seen in Eq. (5).

In summary, we have shown that the $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{(*)\pm}$ decays can be important tools to study the direct CP violation in the charged B system and we found that the theoretical hadronic uncertainties are small. In particular, we have found that

$A_{CP}(B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^{*\pm}) \simeq 22\%$ is large and this is supported by the BABAR data [21] of $(26 \pm 19)\%$, whereas our prediction for $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^\pm$ has a different sign in comparison with the BELLE [17] and BABAR [19, 21] data. More precise measurements are needed in the B experiments at the current and future B-factories. It is clear that these direct CP asymmetries should be used to test the SM and search for new physics. Finally, we note that our study on the direct CP violation can be extended to other modes, such as $B^\pm \rightarrow p\bar{p}(\pi^\pm, \rho^\pm)$ and $B^\pm \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}K^{(*)\pm}$. Explicitly, we predict that $A_{CP} \sim -6\%$, -3% , 3% and -1% for the above decays, respectively.

This work is supported in part by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under Grant #s: NSC-94-2112-M-007-(004,005) and NSC-95-2112-M-007-059-MY3 and the Natural Science and Engineering Council of Canada.

-
- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and K. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
 - [2] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 201802 (2002).
 - [3] K. Abe *et al.* [BELLE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **66**, 071102 (2002).
 - [4] B. Aubert *et al.*, [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 131801 (2004).
 - [5] Y. Chao *et al.*, [BELLE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 191802 (2004).
 - [6] K. Abe *et al.* [BELLE Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0608035; Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 101801 (2005).
 - [7] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 181802 (2005).
 - [8] A. J. Buras, R. Fleischer, S. Recksiegel and F. Schwab, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 101804 (2004).
 - [9] A. J. Buras, R. Fleischer, S. Recksiegel and F. Schwab, Nucl. Phys. B **697**, 133 (2004).
 - [10] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco, M. Nebot and M. N. Rebelo, Nucl. Phys. B **725**, 155 (2005).
 - [11] A. Ali, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20** (2005) 5080 [arXiv:hep-ph/0412128].
 - [12] H. n. Li, arXiv:hep-ph/0605331; and references therein.
 - [13] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, arXiv:hep-ph/0608040.
 - [14] H. J. Lipkin, arXiv:hep-ph/0608284.
 - [15] E. DiMarco, talk presented at ICHEP06, Moscow, Russia, July 26-August 2, 2006.

- [16] Y. Unno, talk presented at ICHEP06, Moscow, Russia, July 26-August 2, 2006.
- [17] M.Z. Wang *et al.* [BELLE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 131801 (2004).
- [18] M. Z. Wang *et al.* [BELLE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. **B617**, 141 (2005).
- [19] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. **D72**, 051101 (2005).
- [20] W.S. Hou and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4247 (2001).
- [21] T.B. Hryn'ova, "Study of B Meson Decays to $p\bar{p}h$ Final States", Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University (2006).
- [22] Y. H. Chen, H. Y. Cheng, B. Tseng and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 094014 (1999);
H. Y. Cheng and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 054029 (2000).
- [23] C. K. Chua, W. S. Hou and S. Y. Tsai, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 054004 (2002).
- [24] H. Y. Cheng and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 014020 (2002).
- [25] C. Q. Geng and Y. K. Hsiao, Phys. Lett. **B619**, 305 (2005).
- [26] S. Y. Tsai, "Study of Three-body Baryonic B Decays", Ph. D thesis, National Taiwan University (2005).
- [27] C.Q. Geng and Y.K. Hsiao, arXiv:hep-ph/0606141.
- [28] C. Q. Geng, Y. K. Hsiao and J. N. Ng, in preparation.
- [29] C.Q. Geng and Y.K. Hsiao, hep-ph/0606036.
- [30] W. M. Yao *et al.* [Particle Data Group], J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
- [31] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 151 (1991).
- [32] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 545(1979) [Erratum-ibid. **43**, 1625 (1979)].
- [33] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2157 (1980).
- [34] S. J. Brodsky, G. P. Lepage and S. A. A. Zaidi, Phys. Rev. **D23**, 1152 (1981).
- [35] C. H. Chen, Phys. Lett. B **638**, 214 (2006).
- [36] K. Abe *et al.* [BELLE Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0508015.
- [37] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and S. Y. Tsai, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 074015 (2006).